



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,947	04/30/2001	Jack T. Burnett	066101.0198	3321

7590 04/10/2006  
Thomas R. Felger  
Baker Botts L. L. P.  
Suite 600  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,947

Applicant(s)

BURNETT ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed January 23, 2006 and September 30, 2005.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 23, 2006 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed September 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argued that:

- a) Simonoff does not teach an organization has "decentralized control over the virtual event."
- b) Simonoff does not teach "the ASP administration module providing templates used by plural contributors to upload content for virtual events, and the ASP administration module granting authority to the plural organizations to create, access, and present virtual events."

- c) Simonoff does not disclose or suggest the “organization administrator is granted authority to grant access by an administrator.”
- d) Simonoff does not teach, “the associated event champion authorized to approve the uploaded content.”

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

4. Regarding item a), as mentioned in previous actions Examiner has interpreted a “virtual event” to be a drawing collaboration session as taught by Simonoff. Also, Simonoff teaches a White Board that allows organizations to commence in the drawing collaboration sessions, (Simonoff col. 8, lines 26-44). Examiner submits Simonoff teaches an organization has “decentralized control over the virtual event” where Simonoff teaches an embodiment that facilitates teacher/student relationships. In this embodiment, an organization can have decentralized control over the virtual event if the organization is the teacher since all other users of the White Board (the students) are provided a view only mode, (Simonoff, col. 18, lines 25-31).

5. Regarding item b), as mentioned in previous actions Examiner has interpreted the White Board taught by Simonoff to be the ASP administration module of the present invention. Examiner submits Simonoff teaches “the ASP administration module providing templates used by plural contributors to upload content for virtual events”, where Simonoff teaches White Board applets being provided to contributors computers so the contributors can upload content for the virtual events, (Simonoff, col.

Art Unit: 2151

9, lines 21-57). Simonoff further teaches “the ASP administration module granting authority to the plural organizations to create, access, and present virtual events”, where Simonoff teaches the White Board requiring plural organizations to log into the White Board so that the organizations can create, access and present virtual events, (Simonoff, col. 8, lines 26-44, and col. 9, line 65 through col. 10, line 11).

6. Regarding item c), Examiner submits Simonoff suggests organization administrators where Simonoff teaches system administrators, (Simonoff, col. 8, lines 37-40, col. 11, lines 44-49, col. 17, lines 22-38, etc.). Simonoff further suggests the “organization administrator is granted authority to grant access by an administrator” where Simonoff discloses a system administrator is predetermined, (Simonoff, col. 14, lines 26-43), and a system administrator has the ability to “kill” White Board clients, (Simonoff, col. 8, lines 37-40, and col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12).

7. Regarding item d), As mentioned in previous actions, although an “event champion module”, is not expressly mentioned in the teachings of Simonoff, it is clear such a module exists within the White Board server taught by Simonoff since its functionality is implemented by the White Board server [i.e. establishing a virtual event architecture that accepts content for the virtual event from contributors (col. 9, line 65-col. 10, line 11)]. Furthermore, Simonoff also suggests “the associated event champion authorized to approve the uploaded content” where Simonoff teaches the White Board

Art Unit: 2151

server authorized to approve or ignore the uploaded content depending on the privilege level of the user receiving the content, (Simonoff, col. 23, lines 42-53).

8. As mentioned in previous actions, Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Furthermore, all remaining arguments presented by Applicant in the response are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 14-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simonoff, U.S. patent 6,463,460.

11. In considering claim 14, Simonoff teaches a system for presenting a virtual event through a network interfaced with the Internet, the system comprising: a rapid event generator accessible by an event champion and operable to define an architecture of the virtual event based on authorizations of a network administrator for an organization to access the network and an organization administrator associated with the authorized organization for the event champion to create the virtual event, wherein the organization administrator grants authority to a plurality of organizations to access the network, wherein each organization controls associated virtual events based on templates from the network administrator, (col. 6, lines 1-67, col. 7, lines 1-6, col. 8, lines 37-40, col. 9, lines 21-57, and col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 43).

12. In considering claim 15, Simonoff teaches a content contributor module associated with the network and operable to upload predetermined content authorized by the event champion. See col. 11, lines 24-43.

13. In considering claim 16, it is inherent in the teachings of Simonoff that the organization administrator module authorizes a virtual event by creating an event instance. See col. 25, lines 3-13.

14. In considering claim 17, Simonoff teaches the rapid event generator comprising an object operable to accept the event instance created by the organization administrator and further operable to generate a virtual event object from the event instance and data provided by the event champion. See col. 6, lines 1-67, and col. 7, lines 1-6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff, in view of Levy et al. (hereinafter Levy), U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124074.

17. In considering claim 1, Simonoff teaches a system for presenting a virtual event through a network interfaced with the Internet, the system comprising: an ASP administration module having authority to grant plural organizations access to the network, the ASP administration module providing templates used by plural contributors to upload content for virtual events, and the ASP administration module granting authority to the plural organizations to create, access, and present virtual events, (col. 8,



Art Unit: 2151

lines 26-44, col. 9, lines 21-57, and col. 9, line 65 through col. 10, line 11); an organization administration module associated with an organization, the organization administration module having authority to create a virtual event associated with the organization, the organization thereby having decentralized control over the virtual event, (col. 8, lines 26-44, col. 18, lines 25-31, and col. 25, lines 3-13); an event champion module associated with the virtual event and operable to establish a virtual event architecture that accepts content for the virtual event from a plurality of predetermined contributors, (col. 9, lines 65-67, col. 10, lines 1-11); and a contributor module interfaced with the network and operable to upload content from the plurality of predetermined contributors to the virtual event based upon authority granted to the contributors from the event champion module, (col. 11, lines 24-43).

Although the teachings of Simonoff disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: an anonymous browser module that grants to an unregistered user authority to view a predetermined portion of the virtual event.

Nevertheless, Simonoff does teach having the ability to shut down unauthorized users, (col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12). Furthermore, anonymous browser modules granting unregistered users authority to view information on the web was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention. Levy discloses such teachings in his discussion of the prior art, (page 2, paragraph 18).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to disclose an anonymous browser module that grants to an unregistered user authority to view a predetermined portion of the virtual event. This

Art Unit: 2151

would have provided a well-known means for both registered and unregistered users to view a virtual event, (Levy, page 2, paragraph 18, Simonoff, col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12).

18. In considering claim 2, Simonoff further teaches an attendee module associated with each virtual event, the attendee module operable to authorize attendees to view virtual event content. See col. 18, lines 25-31.

19. In considering claim 3, it is implicit in the teachings of Simonoff that a member system module establishes membership for users to interface with the network. See col. 14, lines 64-67, col. 15, lines 1-18.

20. In considering claim 4, it is implicit in the teachings of Simonoff that the attendee module interfaces users with the member system module if the users are not members of the network. See col. 14, lines 64-67, col. 15, lines 1-18.

21. In considering claim 5, Simonoff teaches a rapid event generator associated with the event champion module, the rapid event generator operable to present an event champion with one or more templates that define the architecture of the virtual event. See col. 6, lines 1-67, col. 7, lines 1-6.

Art Unit: 2151

22. In considering claim 7, Simonoff teaches a method for presenting virtual events through a network interfaced with the Internet, the method comprising: authorizing plural organizations access to the network by an organization administrator, wherein the organization administrator is granted authority to grant access by an administrator, (col. 8, lines 26-44, col. 11, lines 44-49, col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12, and col. 17, lines 22-38, col. 14, lines 26-43); each organization authorizing the creation of one or more virtual events through the network, each virtual event having an associated event champion, (col. 25, lines 3-13); establishing a virtual event architecture for each virtual event by the associated event champion, the virtual event architecture identifying one or more content contributors, (col. 9, lines 65-67, col. 10, lines 1-11); and uploading by the content contributors from the Internet, the associated event champion authorized to approve the uploaded content, (col. 11, lines 24-43, col. 23, lines 42-53).

Although the teachings of Simonoff disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: providing unregistered attendees authority to view predetermined portions of the virtual events.

Nevertheless, Simonoff does teach having the ability to shut down unauthorized users, (col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12). Furthermore, granting unregistered attendees authority to view information on the web was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention. Levy discloses such teachings in his discussion of the prior art, (page 2, paragraph 18).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to disclose providing unregistered attendees authority to view predetermined portions of the virtual events. This would have provided a well-known means for both registered and unregistered attendees to view a virtual event, (Levy, page 2, paragraph 18, Simonoff, col. 13, line 59 through col. 14, line 12).

23. In considering claim 10, Simonoff teaches identifying one or more sponsors of a virtual event. See col. 17, lines 22-38.

24. In considering claim 11, Simonoff teaches identifying one or more exhibitors of a virtual event. See col. 17, lines 22-38.

25. In considering claim 12, Simonoff teaches: previewing by the event champion of content loaded to a virtual event, (col. 9, lines 65-67, col. 10, lines 1-11); and authorizing the previewed content by the event champion for presentation in the virtual event, (col. 18, lines 25-31).

26. In considering claim 13, Simonoff teaches the content comprising a video presentation. See col. 6, lines 1-11.

27. Claims 6, 8, 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff in view of Levy, and further in view of Estrada et al. (hereinafter Estrada), U.S. patent 6,732,148.

28. In considering claim 6, although the disclosed invention of Simonoff teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: defining the number of attendees, content type, and duration of the virtual event.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Estrada teaches a system for collaboration space object modeling comprising: an object defining the number of members of a group, content type, and the duration of a virtual event, (col. 11, lines 64-67, col. 12, lines 1-14. Also see col. 32, lines 21-32).

Thus, given the teachings of Estrada, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show the rapid event generator defining the number of attendees, the type of content, and the duration of the virtual event. This would have given the attendees more insight to how many other attendees are interested in the same type content, what exactly the content is, and how long an event will take place, Estrada, col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-9.

29. In considering claim 8, Simonoff further teaches: authorizing predetermined attendees to access the virtual event through the Internet, (col. 18, lines 25-31).

Although the disclosed invention of Simonoff teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: accessing the event during a predetermined time period.

Nevertheless, accessing events during predetermined time periods were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Estrada exemplifies this in a system comprising: accessing an object in a calendar during a predetermined time period, (col. 32, lines 21-32).

Thus, given the teachings of Estrada, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show accessing the event during a predetermined time period. This would have given multiple attendees the chance to view the event at the specified predetermined time period, and thus would have given all attendees the same opportunity to perform a function in response to the event, Estrada, col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-9.

30. In considering claim 9, it is implicit in the teachings of Simonoff that membership to a network is established for an attendee before authorizing access by that attendee to the virtual event. See col. 14, lines 64-67, col. 15, lines 1-18.

### ***Conclusion***

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: WO 99/50994, discloses a system for supporting tele-data conferences.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/  
3/31/06

*Khanh Dinh*  
*Primary Examiner*